

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON
DIVISION TWO

STATE OF WASHINGTON,

Respondent,

v.

MATTHEW AHO,

Appellant.

ON APPEAL FROM THE SUPERIOR COURT
OF PIERCE COUNTY

The Honorable Beverly G. Grant

SUPPLEMENTAL REPLY BRIEF

OLIVER R. DAVIS
Attorney for Appellant

WASHINGTON APPELLATE PROJECT
1511 Third Avenue, Suite 701
Seattle, Washington 98101
(206) 587-2711

TABLE OF CONTENTS

A. <u>REPLY ARGUMENT</u>	1
THIS CASE INVOLVES UNRECORDED FOR-CAUSE CHALLENGES AT SIDEBAR WITH NO COURT REPORTER, CONSTITUTING A “CLOSURE” UNDER THIS COURT’S ANDERSON DECISION, AND UNDER THE SUPREME COURT’S LOVE ANALYSIS.	1
1. <u>The Supreme Court in <i>State v. Love</i> found no closure where for-cause challenges at sidebar were on the record in the presence of the court reporter and available for scrutiny by transcript, thus comporting with the public trial right’s “minimum” guarantee.</u>	1
(i) Closure.	2
(ii) No justification for Closure.	2
2. <u>Reversal is required.</u>	3
B. <u>CONCLUSION</u>	3

TABLE OF CONTENTS

WASHINGTON DECISIONS

<u>State v. Calvert Anderson</u> , COA No. 45497-1-II (May 19, 2015)	1,2
<u>State v. Irby</u> , 170 Wn.2d 874, 246 P.3d 796 (2011)	1
<u>State v. Love</u> , Supreme Court No. 86919-4 (July 6, 2015)	1,2
<u>State v. Momah</u> , 167 Wn.2d 140, 217 P.3d 321 (2009).	2

A. REPLY ARGUMENT

> **STATE V. ANDERSON**, *Ct. of Appeals Div. II (May 19, 2015)*

> **STATE V. LOVE**, *Wash. Supreme Court (July 16, 2015)*

THIS CASE INVOLVES UNRECORDED FOR-CAUSE CHALLENGES AT SIDEBAR WITH NO COURT REPORTER, CONSTITUTING A “CLOSURE” UNDER THIS COURT’S ANDERSON DECISION, AND UNDER THE SUPREME COURT’S LOVE ANALYSIS.

1. The Supreme Court in *State v. Love* found no closure where for-cause challenges at sidebar were on the record in the presence of the court reporter and available for scrutiny by transcript, thus comporting with the public trial right’s “minimum” guarantee.

However, as argued, this Court’s recent decision in State v. Calvert Anderson, COA No. 45497-1-II (May 19, 2015), makes clear that the process of taking for-cause challenges at a side-bar that impedes public scrutiny is a closure and a violation of the public trial right, requiring reversal of all of Matthew Aho’s convictions. State v. Anderson, Slip Op., at pp. 2-3.

(i) Closure. The issue whether a procedure constitutes a “closure” of the courtroom is a legal one, reviewed *de novo*. State v. Love, Supreme Court No. 86919-4 (July 16, 2015) (Slip Op., at pp. 1-2) (citing State v. Irby, 170 Wn.2d 874, 880, 246 P.3d 796 (2011)).

In Matthew Aho’s case, the legal question is answered correctly in Anderson. The recent case of Love addresses a circumstance where

additional and determinative procedural facts led to a different result -- in Love, the Supreme Court found that “minimum” public trial rights protection had been provided where for-cause challenges at sidebar were “on the record,” ultimately allowing the public to scrutinize the procedure resulting in jury selection. State v. Love, No. 86919-4 (Slip Op., at pp. 1-2, 4). The Court noted that observers could watch the trial judge and counsel exercise challenges at the bench and – even more importantly -- “[t]he transcript of the discussion about for cause challenges and the struck juror sheet showing the peremptory challenges [we]re both publically available.” Love, Slip Op., at p. 4.

There was no closure in Love, but there was a closure in Anderson and likewise in Mr. Aho’s trial below.

(ii) No justification for Closure. As argued, here, per the standards and analysis in both Anderson and Love, there was a “closure,” and the trial court did not offer any justifying reasons. Certainly, the trial court did not analyze the Bone-Club factors. There was no given justification for holding the process at unrecorded side-bar impeding ultimate public scrutiny, therefore there was a violation upon further review of all evaluative factors. See State v. Momah, 167 Wn.2d 140, 156, 217 P.3d 321 (2009).

2. Reversal is required. The trial court erred in holding the for-cause challenge process at unrecorded side-bar, and reversal of Mr. Aho's convictions is required. State v. Anderson, Slip Op., at pp. 3, 14.

B. CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing and on Mr. Aho's Supplemental Brief on Anderson, this Court should reverse Matthew Aho's convictions.

DATED this 6th day of August, 2015.

Respectfully submitted,

s/ Oliver Davis
OLIVER R. DAVIS
WSBA No. 24560
Washington Appellate Project
Attorneys for Appellant

**IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON
DIVISION TWO**


STATE OF WASHINGTON,)	
)	
Respondent,)	
)	NO. 43932-8-II
v.)	
)	
MATTHEW AHO,)	
)	
Appellant.)	

DECLARATION OF DOCUMENT FILING AND SERVICE

I, MARIA ARRANZA RILEY, STATE THAT ON THE 10TH DAY OF AUGUST, 2015, I CAUSED THE ORIGINAL **SUPPLEMENTAL REPLY BRIEF OF APPELLANT** TO BE FILED IN THE **COURT OF APPEALS – DIVISION TWO** AND A TRUE COPY OF THE SAME TO BE SERVED ON THE FOLLOWING IN THE MANNER INDICATED BELOW:

[X] BRIAN WASANKARI, DPA	()	U.S. MAIL
[PCpatcecf@co.pierce.wa.us]	()	HAND DELIVERY
PIERCE COUNTY PROSECUTOR'S OFFICE	(X)	E-SERVICE VIA
930 TACOMA AVENUE S, ROOM 946		COA PORTAL
TACOMA, WA 98402-2171		

SIGNED IN SEATTLE, WASHINGTON THIS 10TH DAY OF AUGUST, 2015.



X _____

Washington Appellate Project
701 Melbourne Tower
1511 Third Avenue
Seattle, WA 98101
Phone (206) 587-2711
Fax (206) 587-2710

WASHINGTON APPELLATE PROJECT

August 10, 2015 - 4:22 PM

Transmittal Letter

Document Uploaded: 5-439328-Supplemental Reply Brief.pdf

Case Name: STATE V. MATTHEW AHO

Court of Appeals Case Number: 43932-8

Is this a Personal Restraint Petition? Yes ☐ No

The document being Filed is:

Designation of Clerk's Papers

Supplemental Designation of Clerk's Papers

Statement of Arrangements

Motion: _____

Answer/Reply to Motion: _____

☒ Brief: Supplemental Reply

Statement of Additional Authorities

Cost Bill

Objection to Cost Bill

Affidavit

Letter

Copy of Verbatim Report of Proceedings - No. of Volumes: _____

Hearing Date(s): _____

Personal Restraint Petition (PRP)

Response to Personal Restraint Petition

Reply to Response to Personal Restraint Petition

Petition for Review (PRV)

Other: _____

Comments:

No Comments were entered.

Sender Name: Maria A Riley - Email: maria@washapp.org

A copy of this document has been emailed to the following addresses:

PCpatcecf@co.pierce.wa.us